arXiv:1702.00810v1 [math.AC] 2 Feb 2017

ON ZERO-DIVISORS OF SEMIMODULES AND SEMIALGEBRAS

PEYMAN NASEHPOUR

Abstract. In this paper, we generalize McCoy's theorem for the zero-divisors of polynomials and investigate zero-divisors of semimodules and prove that under suitable conditions, the monoid semimodule $M[G]$ has very few zero-divisors if and only if the semimodule M does so. Then we introduce Ohm-Rush and McCoy semialgebras and prove some interesting results for prime ideals of monoid semirings. In the last section of the paper, we investigate the set of zero-divisors of McCoy semialgebras.

0. Introduction

The main scope of this paper is to investigate zero-divisors of semimodules and semialgebras. In this paper, all semirings are commutative and possess nonzero identity and all semimodules are unital.

A classical result in commutative algebra states that if R is a commutative ring with a nonzero identity, f is a zero-divisor on $R[X]$, then f can be annihilated by a nonzero constant $b \in R$ [17, Theorem 2]. The main motivation of this paper is to investigate semialgebras having McCoy's property in the following sense:

Question 0.1. Let S be a semiring and B an S-semialgebra. If f and g are elements of B, does $gf = 0$ with $g \neq 0$ imply that f is annihilated by a nonzero constant b in S?

In the first section of the paper, we prove in Theorem 1.1 the following result: Let M be an arbitrary S-semimodule and G a cancellative torsion-free commutative monoid. If $f \in S[G]$ is a zero-divisor on $M[G]$, then it can be annihilated by a nonzero constant $b \in M$ (McCoy's Theorem for Semimodules).

Of course this result gives an affirmative answer to the above question, when $B = S[G]$ and G is a cancellative torsion-free commutative monoid.

After that in Theorem 1.2, we prove that if S is a semiring and G a cancellative torsion-free commutative monoid, then $\mathbf{p}[G]$ is a prime ideal of $S[G]$ if and only if $\mathbf{p}$ is a subtractive and prime ideal of S. With the help of this result and prime avoidance theorem for semirings (See Theorem 1.14), we investigate the set of zero-divisors of an $S[G]$-semimodule $M[G]$ and prove that if

$$Z_S(M) = \mathbf{p}_1 \cup \mathbf{p}_2 \cup \cdots \cup \mathbf{p}_n,$$

where $\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathrm{Ass}_S(M)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, then

$$Z_{S[G]}(M[G]) = \mathbf{p}_1[G] \cup \mathbf{p}_2[G] \cup \cdots \cup \mathbf{p}_n[G]$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16Y60, 13B25, 13F25, 06D75.

Key words and phrases. Semiring, Semiring polynomials, Monoid semiring, Weak Gaussian semiring.

and $\mathbf{p}_i[G] \in \mathrm{Ass}_{R[G]}(M[G])$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Note that if M is an S-semimodule, an ideal $\mathbf{p}$ of a semiring S is called an associated prime ideal of M, if $\mathbf{p} = \mathrm{Ann}(m)$ for some $m \in M$. The set of all associated prime ideals of M is denoted by $\mathrm{Ass}_S(M)$ or simply $\mathrm{Ass}(M)$.

Let us recall that in [13], a ring R is defined to have Property (A), if each finitely generated ideal $I \subseteq Z(R)$ has a nonzero annihilator. We define an S-semimodule M to have Property (A), if each finitely generated ideal $I \subseteq Z_S(M)$ has a nonzero annihilator in M. We also define that an S-semimodule M is an Auslander semimodule, if $Z(S) \subseteq Z_S(M)$. This definition is inspired from Auslander's Zero-Divisor Conjecture in module theory (Cf. [12, p. 8]). We end the first section of the present paper by proving that if M is an Auslander S-semimodule, has Property (A), and G is a commutative, cancellative and torsion-free monoid, then $M[G]$ is an Auslander $S[G]$-semimodule (See Theorem 1.22).

In the second section of the paper, we introduce Ohm-Rush and McCoy semialgebras. We define an S-semialgebra B to be an Ohm-Rush S-semialgebra, if $f \in c(f)B$ for each $f \in B$, where by $c(f)$, we mean the intersection of all ideals I of S such that $f \in IB$ (See Definition 2.1). Note that the term Ohm-Rush algebra was used for an R-algebra that is a content R-module by Epstein and Shapiro in [7].

Now let B be an S-semialgebra. We define B to be a McCoy S-semialgebra if B is an Ohm-Rush S-semialgebra and $g \cdot f = 0$ for $g, f \in B$ with $g \neq 0$ implies $s \cdot c(f) = 0$ for a nonzero $s \in S$ (Check Definition 2.4).

After giving these definitions and some examples for them, we generalize some theorems related to weak Gaussian semirings and weak content semialgebras proved in [21] (For example see Theorems 2.6, 2.8). These results are useful for the main purpose of the final section of the paper. In fact, this section can be considered as a preliminary section for the last section of the paper which discusses the zero-divisors of McCoy semialgebras.

In the third section of the present paper, we prove a couple of theorems for the relationship between the set of zero-divisors of a semiring S and a McCoy semialgebra B on S. For example in Theorem 3.5, we show that if S is a weak Gaussian semiring and B a McCoy and weak content S-semialgebra with homogeneous c and the corresponding homomorphism λ of the S-semialgebra B is injective, then S has very few zero-divisors if and only if B does so.

We also show that if S is a weak Gaussian semiring and B is a McCoy and weak content S-semialgebra such that the corresponding homomorphism λ is injective and $c : B \to \mathrm{Fid}(S)$ is a homogeneous and an onto function, then B has few zero-divisors if and only if S has few zero-divisors and property (A) (See Theorem 3.9).

We finalize the last section by giving the definition of strong Krull prime ideals for semirings. We define a prime ideal $\mathbf{p}$ of a semiring S to be a strong Krull prime of S, if for any finitely generated ideal I of S, there exists a $z \in S$ such that $I \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}(z) \subseteq \mathbf{p}$, whenever $I \subseteq \mathbf{p}$. After giving this definition, we prove that if B is a weak content S-semialgebra such that the corresponding homomorphism λ is injective and c is homogeneous and $\mathbf{p}$ is a strong Krull prime of S, then either

$\mathbf{p}B = B$ or $\mathbf{p}B$ is a strong Krull prime of B. And then, we show that if B is a McCoy and weak content S-semialgebra such that the corresponding homomorphism λ is injective and c is homogeneous and $Z(S)$ is a finite union of strong Krull primes of S, then $Z(B)$ is a finite union of strong Krull primes of B (See Definition 3.10, Lemma 3.11, and Theorem 3.12).

In this paper, any semiring is commutative with a nonzero identity and all semimodules are unital. For semirings and semimodules and their applications, one may refer to the books [10], [14], and [11].

After this short introduction, we pass to the next section to investigate zero-divisors of semimodules.

1. Zero-Divisors of Semimodules

Let us recall that for a semiring S and a nonzero S-semimodule M, an element $s \in S$ is called a zero-divisor on M, if there is a nonzero $m \in M$ such that $sm = 0$. The set of all zero-divisors of M is denoted by $Z_S(M)$, or simply by $Z(M)$, if there is no fear of ambiguity.

Let us recall a classical result in monoid theory, which states that a cancellative torsion-free commutative monoid can be embedded into a totally ordered Abelian group (Cf. [9, Corollary 15.7]). We will use this theorem for proving Theorem 1.1, which is a generalization of a classical result for zero-divisors of polynomial rings by Neal Henry McCoy ([17, Theorem 2]).

Also let us recall another classical result, which says that any nonzero finitely generated torsion-free Abelian group is isomorphic to the sum of n copies of $\mathbb{Z}$, i.e., $\oplus_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{Z}$ ([28, Theorem 25.23]). Note that this means that in some cases, arguments on monoid semiring $S[G]$ (semimodule $M[G]$), where S (M) is a semiring (semimodule) and G is a cancellative torsion-free commutative monoid, can be reduced to finite-variable Laurent polynomial semiring (semimodule) over S (M), as we will see in this section very soon.

Theorem 1.1 (McCoy's Theorem for Semimodules)**.** *Let M be an arbitrary S-semimodule and G a cancellative torsion-free commutative monoid. If $f \in S[G]$ is a zero-divisor on $M[G]$, then it can be annihilated by a nonzero constant $b \in M$.*

Proof. For the proof, we take $f \in S[G]$ to be of the form $f = a_0X^{u_n} + \cdots + a_nX^{u_0}$ ($n \geq 0$, $a_i \in S$, $u_i > u_{i-1}$ and $a_0 \neq 0$) and let $g \in M[G] - \{0\}$ with $f \cdot g = 0$. If g is a monomial, then the unique nonzero coefficient of g annihilates f. So we can assume that $g = b_0X^{t_m} + \cdots + b_mX^{t_0}$ ($m \geq 1$, $b_i \in M$, $t_i > t_{i-1}$ and $b_0 \neq 0$). Now consider the elements $a_0 \cdot g, \ldots, a_n \cdot g$ of $M[G]$. If all of these elements are zero, then b_0 annihilates any coefficient of f and the theorem is proved. Otherwise there is an $r \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $a_0 \cdot g = \cdots = a_{r-1} \cdot g = 0$, while $a_r \cdot g \neq 0$. This causes $(a_rX^{u_{n-r}} + \cdots + a_nX^{u_0}) \cdot g = 0$, since $f \cdot g = 0$. But this implies that $a_r \cdot b_0 = 0$. Therefore $h = a_r \cdot g \neq 0$ has less monomials than g and $f \cdot h = f \cdot a_r \cdot g = 0$. So by mathematical induction on the numbers of the monomials of g, there is a nonzero constant $b \in M$ such that $f \cdot b = 0$ and the proof is complete. □

Let us recall that a nonempty subset I of a semiring S is said to be an ideal of S, if $a + b \in I$ for all $a, b \in I$ and $sa \in I$ for all $s \in S$ and $a \in I$. It is clear that the zero element 0 belongs to any ideal of S. We denote the set of all ideals of S by $\mathrm{Id}(S)$. An ideal I of a semiring S is called a proper ideal of the semiring S if $I \neq S$. An ideal I of a semiring S is said to be subtractive, if $a + b \in I$ and $a \in I$

implies that $b \in I$ for all $a, b \in S$. We say that a semiring S is subtractive if each ideal of the semiring S is subtractive. Finally, we note that a proper ideal $\mathbf{p}$ of a semiring S is called a prime ideal of S, if $ab \in \mathbf{p}$ implies either $a \in \mathbf{p}$ or $b \in \mathbf{p}$.

Now we proceed to prove a theorem for prime ideals of monoid semirings that is a generalization of a theorem for prime ideals of polynomial semirings due to Susan LaGrassa, a student of Dan Anderson, which states that if $\mathbf{p}$ is an ideal of a semiring S and X is an indeterminate over S, then $\mathbf{p}[X]$ is a prime ideal of $S[X]$ if and only if $\mathbf{p}$ is a subtractive prime ideal of S ([16, Theorem 2.6]).

Theorem 1.2. *Let S be a semiring and G a cancellative torsion-free commutative monoid. Then $\boldsymbol{p}[G]$ is a prime ideal of $S[G]$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{p}$ is a subtractive and prime ideal of S.*

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$): Suppose that $\mathbf{p}[G]$ is a prime ideal of $S[G]$ and $a, b \in S$ such that $ab \in \mathbf{p}$. Then either $a \in \mathbf{p}[G]$ or $b \in \mathbf{p}[G]$. But $\mathbf{p}[G] \cap S = \mathbf{p}$ and so we have proved that $\mathbf{p}$ is a prime ideal of S. Now suppose that $a, b \in S$ such that $a + b, a \in \mathbf{p}$ and take a nonzero $v \in G$. Set $f = a + bX^v$ and $g = b + (a + b)X^v$. We have $fg = ab + (a^2 + ab + b^2)X^v + (ab + b^2)X^{2v}$ and so $fg \in \mathbf{p}[G]$. But since $\mathbf{p}[G]$ is prime, either $f \in \mathbf{p}[G]$ or $g \in \mathbf{p}[G]$ and in each case, $b \in \mathbf{p}$ and so we have showed that $\mathbf{p}$ is subtractive.

($\Leftarrow$): Suppose that $\mathbf{p}$ is a subtractive prime ideal of S and $fg \in \mathbf{p}[G]$ for some $f, g \in S[G]$. Imagine $f \in S[G]$ is of the form $f = a_0X^{u_n} + \cdots + a_nX^{u_0}$ ($n \geq 0$, $a_i \in S$, and $u_i > u_{i-1}$) and $g \in S[G]$ of the form $h = b_0X^{t_m} + \cdots + b_mX^{t_0}$ ($m \geq 0$, $b_i \in S$ and $t_i > t_{i-1}$). Since G is a cancellative torsion-free commutative semigroup, it can be embedded into a torsion-free Abelian group $\mathrm{gp}(G)$ ([1, p. 50]). Therefore the subgroup G_0 generated by $u_n, \ldots, u_0, t_m, \ldots, t_0$ is isomorphic to a finite copies of $\mathbb{Z}$ and this means that $fh \in \mathbf{p}[G_0]$, where $S[G_0]$ is isomorphic to a finite-variable Laurent polynomial semiring. But by Theorem 39 in [21], $\mathbf{p}[G_0]$ is a prime ideal and therefore either $f \in \mathbf{p}[G_0]$ or $h \in \mathbf{p}[G_0]$ and this means that either $f \in \mathbf{p}[G]$ or $h \in \mathbf{p}[G]$ and the proof is complete. □

Let us recall that a semiring E is called entire if $ab = 0$ implies either $a = 0$ or $b = 0$ for all $a, b \in E$ ([10]).

Corollary 1.3. *Let S be a semiring and G a cancellative torsion-free commutative monoid. Then S is an entire semiring if and only if $S[G]$ is an entire semiring.*

Corollary 1.4. *Let M be an S-semimodule and G a cancellative torsion-free commutative monoid. If $\boldsymbol{p} = \mathrm{Ann}(m)$ is a prime ideal of S for some $m \in M$, then $\boldsymbol{p}[G] = \mathrm{Ann}(m)$ is a prime ideal of $S[G]$.*

Proof. Since $\mathbf{p} = \mathrm{Ann}(m)$ is subtractive, by Theorem 1.2, $\mathbf{p}[G]$ is a prime ideal of $S[G]$. The proof of $\mathbf{p}[G] = \mathrm{Ann}(m)$ is straightforward. □

In [3], it has been defined that a ring R has few zero-divisors, if $Z(R)$ is a finite union of prime ideals. Rings having very few zero-divisors were investigated in [22]. Modules having few and very few zero-divisors were defined and investigated in [19], [20], [23], and [24]. We give the following definition and prove some interesting results for zero-divisors of monoid semimodules. Let us recall that if M is an S-semimodule, an ideal $\mathbf{p}$ of a semiring S is called an associated prime ideal of M, if $\mathbf{p} = \mathrm{Ann}(m)$ for some $m \in M$. The set of all associated prime ideals of M is denoted by $\mathrm{Ass}_S(M)$ or simply $\mathrm{Ass}(M)$.

Definition 1.5. We define an S-semimodule M to have very few zero-divisors, if $Z_S(M)$ is a finite union of prime ideals in $\mathrm{Ass}_S(M)$.

In order to give some suitable examples for semimodules having very few zero-divisors, we prove the following theorem that is a semiring version of a theorem in commutative algebra due to Herstein (1923-1988):

Theorem 1.6. *Let M be a nonzero S-semimodule. If $\boldsymbol{p}$ is a maximal element of all ideals of the form $\mathrm{Ann}(m)$ of S, where m is a nonzero element of M, then $\boldsymbol{p}$ is prime.*

Proof. Take $\mathbf{p} = \mathrm{Ann}(m)$ and let $ab \in \mathrm{Ann}(m)$. Let $a \notin \mathbf{p}$. So $am \neq 0$ and $\mathrm{Ann}(am) \supseteq \mathbf{p}$. But $\mathbf{p}$ is maximal among ideals of S in the form of $\mathrm{Ann}(x)$ with $x \in M - \{0\}$. This causes $\mathrm{Ann}(am) = \mathrm{Ann}(m)$. On the other hand, $abm = 0$ so $b \in \mathrm{Ann}(m)$ and this means that $\mathbf{p}$ is prime and the proof is complete. □

Note that an S-semimodule M is called Noetherian, if any S-subsemimodule of M is finitely generated. A semiring S is Noetherian if it is Noetherian as an S-semimodule ([10]).

Corollary 1.7. *If S is a Noetherian semiring and M is an S-semimodule, then $Z(M)$ is a union of subtractive prime ideals of S.*

Proof. Note that if M is an S-semimodule, then $Z(M) = \bigcup_{m \in M-\{0\}} \mathrm{Ann}(m)$. Set $\mathcal{C}$ to be the collection of all maximal elements of $\{\mathrm{Ann}(m) : m \in M - \{0\}\}$. Since S is Noetherian, $\mathcal{C}$ is nonempty. Therefore $Z(M) = \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{C}} I$. By Theorem 1.6, any element of $\mathcal{C}$ is prime of the form $\mathrm{Ann}(m)$ for some $m \neq 0$, which is a subtractive ideal. Hence, $Z(M)$ is a union of subtractive prime ideals of S and the proof is complete. □

By Theorem 1.6 and its immediate corollary, we know that if S is Noetherian, $\mathrm{Ass}(M) \neq \emptyset$ and $Z(M)$ is the union of all prime ideals in $\mathrm{Ass}(M)$. Now we prove the following interesting theorem:

Theorem 1.8. *Let S be a Noetherian semiring and M a Noetherian S-semimodule. Then $\mid \mathrm{Ass}_S(M) \mid < \infty$.*

Proof. Let S be Noetherian, so $\mathrm{Ass}(M) \neq \emptyset$. Assume that $\{\mathbf{p}_i = \mathrm{Ann}(m_i)\}_i$ is the family of maximal primes of $Z(M)$. Take N to be the S-subsemimodule of M generated by the elements $\{m_i\}_i$, where $\mathbf{p}_i = \mathrm{Ann}(m_i)$. Since M is Noetherian, N is generated by a finite number of elements in $\{m_i\}_i$, say by $m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_k$. If any further m's exists, it can be written as a linear combination of $m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_k$, i.e., for example we have $m_{k+1} = t_1 m_1 + t_2 m_2 + \cdots + t_k m_k$ $(t_i \in S)$. This implies that $\mathbf{p}_1 \cap \mathbf{p}_2 \cap \cdots \cap \mathbf{p}_k \subseteq \mathbf{p}_{k+1}$ and therefore $\mathbf{p}_l \subseteq \mathbf{p}_{k+1}$ for some $1 \leq l \leq k$, contradicting the maximality of $\mathbf{p}_l$. Hence there are no further m_i's ($\mathbf{p}_i$'s) and the proof is complete. □

Remark 1.9. If S is a Noetherian semiring and M is a Noetherian S-semimodule, then by Theorem 1.8, M has very few zero-divisors. For example let S be a finite proper semiring, i.e., a finite semiring that is not a ring, and M a finite S-semimodule (e.g. $M = S^n$), then M is also Noetherian and therefore it has very few zero-divisors. A good example for a finite proper semiring is $\mathrm{Id}(\mathbb{Z}_n)$, i.e., the semiring of ideals of the finite ring $\mathbb{Z}_n$. Particularly it is clear that the semiring $\mathrm{Id}(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ possesses nonzero zero-divisors, if $n \geq 2$ is not a prime number.

Remark 1.10. ([19, Remark 21]) Let R be a ring and consider the following three conditions on R:

(1) R is a Noetherian ring.
(2) R has very few zero-divisors.
(3) R has few zero-divisors.

Then, (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) and none of the implications are reversible.

Proof. For (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) use [15, Theorem 80, p. 55]. Actually we have proved in Theorem 1.8 that the semiring version of this implication holds. It is obvious that (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3).

Suppose $\mathbf{k}$ is a field,

$$D = \mathbf{k}[X_1, X_2, X_3, \ldots, X_n, \ldots]$$

and

$$\mathbf{m} = (X_1, X_2, X_3, \ldots, X_n, \ldots)$$

and at last $\mathbf{a} = (X_1^2, X_2^2, X_3^2, \ldots, X_n^2, \ldots)$. Since D is a domain, D has very few zero-divisors while it is not a Noetherian ring. Also consider the ring $R = D/\mathbf{a}$. It is easy to check that R is a local ring with the only prime ideal $\mathbf{m}/\mathbf{a}$ and $Z(R) = \mathbf{m}/\mathbf{a}$ and finally $\mathbf{m}/\mathbf{a} \notin \operatorname{Ass}_R(R)$. Note that $\operatorname{Ass}_R(R) = \emptyset$. □

In [13], it has been defined that a ring R has Property (A), if each finitely generated ideal $I \subseteq Z(R)$ has a nonzero annihilator. In [23], a generalization of this definition was given for modules. We give a semimodule version for Property (A) in the following definition:

Definition 1.11. We define an S-semimodule M to have Property (A), if each finitely generated ideal $I \subseteq Z_S(M)$ has a nonzero annihilator in M.

Remark 1.12. If an S-semimodule M has very few zero-divisors, then M has Property (A).

Let M be an S-semimodule. We say an element $s \in S$ is M-regular if it is not a zero-divisor on M, i.e., $s \notin Z_S(M)$. We say an ideal of S is M-regular if it contains an M-regular element. We also need to recall that if $f = s_0 + s_1X + \cdots + s_nX^n$ is a polynomial in $S[X]$, then the content of f, denoted by $c(f)$, is defined to be the finitely generated ideal $(s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ of S.

Theorem 1.13. *Let G be a commutative, cancellative and torsion-free monoid and M be an S-semimodule. The following statements are equivalent:*

(1) The S-semimodule M has Property (A).
(2) For all $f \in S[G]$, f is $M[G]$-regular if and only if $c(f)$ is M-regular.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Let the S-semimodule M have Property (A). If $f \in S[G]$ is $M[G]$-regular, then $f \cdot m \neq 0$ for all nonzero $m \in M$ and so $c(f) \cdot m \neq (0)$ for all nonzero $m \in M$ and according to the definition of Property (A), $c(f) \nsubseteq Z_S(M)$. This means that $c(f)$ is M-regular. Now let $c(f)$ be M-regular. So $c(f) \nsubseteq Z_S(M)$ and this means that $c(f) \cdot m \neq (0)$ for all nonzero $m \in M$ and hence $f \cdot m \neq 0$ for all nonzero $m \in M$. Since G is a commutative, cancellative and torsion-free monoid, by Theorem 1.1, f is not a zero-divisor of $M[G]$, i.e., f is $M[G]$-regular.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1): Let I be a finitely generated ideal of S such that $I \subseteq Z_S(M)$. Then there exists an $f \in S[G]$ such that $c(f) = I$. But $c(f)$ is not M-regular, therefore according to our assumption, f is not $M[G]$-regular. Therefore there

exists a nonzero $m \in M$ such that $f \cdot m = 0$ and this means that $I \cdot m = (0)$, i.e., I has a nonzero annihilator in M. □

Note that if I is an ideal of a semiring S and $\mathbf{p}_i$ $(1 \leq i \leq n)$ are subtractive prime ideals of S and $I \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{p}_i$, then $I \subseteq \mathbf{p}_i$ for some i. This version of the Prime Avoidance Theorem for semirings, enjoys exactly the same proof of the ring version of the Prime Avoidance Theorem mentioned in [15, Theorem 81], therefore we bring the statement, without proving it, in the following theorem only for the sake of reference:

Theorem 1.14 (Prime Avoidance Theorem for Semirings)**.** *Let S be a semiring, I an ideal, and $\boldsymbol{p}_i$ $(1 \leq i \leq n)$ subtractive prime ideals of S. If $I \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^{n} \boldsymbol{p}_i$, then $I \subseteq \boldsymbol{p}_i$ for some i.*

Theorem 1.15. *Let M be an S-semimodule and G a commutative, cancellative and torsion-free monoid. Then the $S[G]$-semimodule $M[G]$ has very few zero-divisors if and only if the S-semimodule M has very few zero-divisors.*

Proof. ($\Leftarrow$): Let $Z_S(M) = \mathbf{p}_1 \cup \mathbf{p}_2 \cup \cdots \cup \mathbf{p}_n$, where $\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathrm{Ass}_S(M)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. We will show that $Z_{S[G]}(M[G]) = \mathbf{p}_1[G] \cup \mathbf{p}_2[G] \cup \cdots \cup \mathbf{p}_n[G]$. Let $f \in Z_{S[G]}(M[G])$, so there exists an $m \in M - \{0\}$ such that $f \cdot m = 0$ and so $c(f) \cdot m = (0)$. Therefore $c(f) \subseteq Z_S(M)$ and this means that $c(f) \subseteq \mathbf{p}_1 \cup \mathbf{p}_2 \cup \cdots \cup \mathbf{p}_n$ and according to Theorem 1.14, we have $c(f) \subseteq \mathbf{p}_i$, for some $1 \leq i \leq n$ and therefore $f \in \mathbf{p}_i[G]$. Now let $f \in \mathbf{p}_1[G] \cup \mathbf{p}_2[G] \cup \cdots \cup \mathbf{p}_n[G]$, so there exists an i such that $f \in \mathbf{p}_i[G]$, so $c(f) \subseteq \mathbf{p}_i$ and $c(f)$ has a nonzero annihilator in M and this means that f is a zero-divisor of $M[G]$. Note that by Corollary 1.4, $\mathbf{p}_i[G] \in \mathrm{Ass}_{R[G]}(M[G])$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

($\Rightarrow$): Let $Z_{S[G]}(M[G]) = \cup_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{q}_i$, where $\mathbf{q}_i \in \mathrm{Ass}_{S[G]}(M[G])$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Therefore $Z_G(M) = \cup_{i=1}^{n} (\mathbf{q}_i \cap S)$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\mathbf{q}_i \cap S \nsubseteq \mathbf{q}_j \cap S$ for all $i \neq j$. Now we prove that $\mathbf{q}_i \cap S \in \mathrm{Ass}_S(M)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Consider $h \in M[G]$ such that $\mathbf{q}_i = \mathrm{Ann}(h)$ and $h = m_1 X^{g_1} + m_2 X^{g_2} + \cdots + m_n X^{g_n}$, where $m_1, \ldots, m_n \in M$ and $g_1, \ldots, g_n \in G$. It is easy to see that $\mathbf{q}_i \cap S = \mathrm{Ann}(c(h)) \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}(m_1) \subseteq Z_S(M)$ and by the Theorem 1.14, $\mathbf{q}_1 \cap S = \mathrm{Ann}(m_1)$. □

Let us recall that a semiring S is called a weak Gaussian semiring, if $c(f)c(g) \subseteq \sqrt{c(fg)}$ for all $f, g \in S[X]$ ([21, Definition 18]). Now let, for the moment, S be a weak Gaussian semiring and M an S-semimodule such that the set $Z_S(M)$ of zero-divisors of M is a finite union of prime ideals. One can consider $Z_S(M) = \cup_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{p}_i$ such that $\mathbf{p}_i \nsubseteq \cup_{j=1 \wedge j \neq i}^{n} \mathbf{p}_j$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Obviously we have $\mathbf{p}_i \nsubseteq \mathbf{p}_j$ for all $i \neq j$. Also, it is easy to check that, if $Z_S(M) = \cup_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{p}_i$ and $Z_S(M) = \cup_{k=1}^{m} \mathbf{q}_k$ such that $\mathbf{p}_i \nsubseteq \mathbf{p}_j$ for all $i \neq j$ and $\mathbf{q}_k \nsubseteq \mathbf{q}_l$ for all $k \neq l$, then $m = n$ and $\{\mathbf{p}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{p}_n\} = \{\mathbf{q}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{q}_n\}$, i.e., these prime ideals are uniquely determined (Use Theorem 1.14). This is the base for the following definition:

Definition 1.16. An S-semimodule M is said to have few zero-divisors of degree n, if $Z_S(M)$ is a finite union of n prime ideals $\mathbf{p}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{p}_n$ of S such that $\mathbf{p}_i \nsubseteq \mathbf{p}_j$ for all $i \neq j$.

Theorem 1.17. *Let S be a weak Gaussian semiring, M an S-semimodule, and G a commutative, cancellative and torsion-free monoid. Then the $S[G]$-semimodule*

$M[G]$ has few zero-divisors of degree n if and only if the S-semimodule M has few zero-divisors of degree n and Property (A).

Proof. ($\Leftarrow$): By considering the S-semimodule M having Property (A), similar to the proof of Theorem 1.15, we have if $Z_S(M) = \cup_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{p}_i$, then $Z_{S[G]}(M[G]) = \cup_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{p}_i[G]$. Also it is obvious that $\mathbf{p}_i[G] \subseteq \mathbf{p}_j[G]$ if and only if $\mathbf{p}_i \subseteq \mathbf{p}_j$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. These two imply that the $R[G]$-semimodule $M[G]$ has few zero-divisors of degree n.

($\Rightarrow$): Note that $Z_S(M) \subseteq Z_{S[G]}(M[G])$. It is easy to check that if $Z_{R[G]}(M[G]) = \cup_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{q}_i$, where $\mathbf{q}_i$ are prime ideals of $S[G]$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, then $Z_S(M) = \cup_{i=1}^{n} (\mathbf{q}_i \cap S)$. Now we prove that the S-semimodule M has Property (A). Let $I \subseteq Z_S(M)$ be a finitely generated ideal of S. Choose $f \in S[G]$ such that $I = c(f)$. So $c(f) \subseteq Z_S(M)$ and obviously $f \in Z_{S[G]}(M[G])$ and according to McCoy's property, there exists a nonzero $m \in M$ such that $f \cdot m = 0$. This means that $I \cdot m = 0$ and I has a nonzero annihilator in M. Consider that by a similar discussion in ($\Leftarrow$), the S-semimodule M has few zero-divisors obviously not less than size n and this completes the proof. □

An R-module M is said to be primal, if $Z_R(M)$ is an ideal of R ([2]). Similarly we define primal semimodules as follows:

Definition 1.18. We define an S-semimodule M to be primal if $Z_S(M)$ is an ideal of S.

It is easy to check that if $Z_S(M)$ is an ideal of S, then it is a prime ideal and therefore the S-semimodule M is primal if and only if M has few zero-divisors of degree one.

Example 1.19. Let $(P, +, 0)$ be an idempotent commutative monoid and set $S = P \cup \{1\}$. Let extend addition on S as $a + 1 = 1 + a = 1$ for all $a \in S$ and define multiplication over S as $ab = 0$ for all $a, b \in P$ and $a \cdot 1 = 1 \cdot a = a$ for all $a \in S$. It is, then, easy to check that $(S, +, \cdot)$ is a semiring and $Z_S(S) = P$ is a prime ideal of S and therefore S is a primal S-semimodule ([21, Proposition 20]).

Corollary 1.20. *Let S be a weak Gaussian semiring and M an S-semimodule and G a commutative, cancellative and torsion-free monoid. Then the $S[G]$-semimodule $M[G]$ is primal if and only if the R-semimodule M is primal and has Property (A).*

Auslander's Zero-Divisor Conjecture (ZDC for short) in module theory states that if R is a Noetherian local ring, M is an R-module of finite type and finite projective dimension and $r \in R$ is not a zero-divisor on M, then r is not a zero-divisor on R [12, p. 8]. This inspires us to give the following definition:

Definition 1.21. We define an S-semimodule M to be an Auslander semimodule, if $Z(S) \subseteq Z_S(M)$.

Theorem 1.22. *Let M be an Auslander S-semimodule, have Property (A) and G a commutative, cancellative and torsion-free monoid. Then $M[G]$ is an Auslander $S[G]$-semimodule.*

Proof. Let $f \in Z(S[G])$. By Theorem 1.1, there is a nonzero element $s \in S$ such that $f \cdot s = 0$. This implies that $c(f) \subseteq Z(S)$. But M is an Auslander semimodule, so $Z(S) \subseteq Z_S(M)$, which implies that $c(f) \subseteq Z_S(M)$. On the other

hand, M has Property (A). So $c(f)$ has a nonzero annihilator, which implies that $f \in Z_{S[G]}(M[G])$ and the proof is complete. □

2. McCoy Semialgebras

Let us recall that, similar to McCoy's theorem for zero-divisors of polynomial rings, David Fields, a student of Robert Gilmer, proved that if R is a commutative Noetherian ring and a nonzero power series $f \in R[[X]]$ is a zero-divisor in power series ring $R[[X]]$, then there exists a nonzero element $r \in R$ such that $r \cdot f = 0$ ([8, Theorem 5]). On the other hand, if B is a content R-algebra and a nonzero element $f \in B$ is a zero-divisor in B, then there exists a nonzero element $r \in R$ such that $r \cdot f = 0$ [26, Statement 6.1]. Today we know that David Field's result is in fact a corollary of this result that formal power series $R[[X]]$ over a Noetherian ring S is a content R-algebra, a wonderful theorem that was proved just recently by Epstein and Shapiro, in [5]. Note that McCoy's property holds for content semialgebras as well ([21, Proposition 31]).

What we have done in Theorem 1.1 of the current paper, is that we have shown that McCoy's property holds for monoid semirings. The main purpose of this section is to show that McCoy's property for semialgebras combined with weak content condition for them gives a couple of interesting results. In order to do this, first we need to define Ohm-Rush S-semialgebras. Note that Ohm-Rush algebra is a term suggested for an R-algebra that is a content R-module in [7, Definition 2.1]. The concepts of content modules and algebras were introduced and investigated in [26], [4], and [27].

Definition 2.1. We define an S-semialgebra B to be an Ohm-Rush S-semialgebra, if $f \in c(f)B$ for each $f \in B$, where by $c(f)$, we mean the intersection of all ideals I of S such that $f \in IB$.

The proof of the following proposition is straightforward, but we bring it here only for the sake of reference.

Proposition 2.2. *If B is an Ohm-Rush S-semialgebra, then the following statements hold:*

1. *For any $f \in B$, $c(f) = (0)$ if and only if $f = 0$*
2. *For any $f \in B$, $c(f)$ is a finitely generated ideal of S;*
3. *For any ideal I of S, $c(f) \subseteq I$ if and only if $f \in IB$;*
4. *For each $f, g \in B$, $c(fg) \subseteq c(f)c(g)$.*

Imagine B is an Ohm-Rush S-semialgebra and take $f \in B$ and $s \in S$. By definition, $f \in c(f)B$ and this implies that $s \cdot f \in s \cdot c(f)B$. So $c(s \cdot f) \subseteq s \cdot c(f)$ and therefore if $s \cdot c(f) = (0)$, then $c(s \cdot f) = (0)$, which implies that $s \cdot f = 0$. On the other hand, from content algebras, we know that if B is an Ohm-Rush R-algebra, then $c(r \cdot f) = r \cdot c(f)$ for any $r \in R$ and $f \in B$ if and only if B is a flat R-algebra [26, Corollary 1.6]. Therefore for flat Ohm-Rush R-algebra B, $r \cdot f = 0$ implies $r \cdot c(f) = (0)$ for any $r \in R$ and $f \in B$. So the question is if for any S-semialgebra B, $s \cdot f = 0$ implies $s \cdot c(f) = 0$. The following example shows that this is not the case even for some Ohm-Rush algebras.

Example 2.3. Let $(R, \mathbf{m})$ be a discrete valuation ring, where $\mathbf{m}$ is its unique maximal ideal. Let $B = R/\mathbf{m}^2$. By [26, Proposition 2.1], B is an Ohm-Rush R-algebra. Now let g, f be in $B - \{0\}$ such that $gf = 0$. If we take $f = r + \mathbf{m}^2$ and

$g = s + \mathbf{m}^2$, then obviously we have $r, s \notin \mathbf{m}^2$, while $rs \in \mathbf{m}^2$ and in the language of valuation rings, we get $0 \leq v(r), v(s) \leq 1$, while $v(r) + v(s) = v(rs) \geq 2$, which implies that $v(r) = v(s) = 1$. Obviously in the R-algebra B, we have $sf = 0$, since $s(r + \mathbf{m}^2) = rs + \mathbf{m}^2 = \mathbf{m}^2$.

Now let us calculate $c(f)$:

$c(f) = \cap\{I \in \mathrm{Id}(R) : f \in IB\} = \cap\{I \in \mathrm{Id}(R) : (r + \mathbf{m}^2) \in I \cdot (R/\mathbf{m}^2)\} = \cap\{I \in \mathrm{Id}(R) : (r + \mathbf{m}^2) \in I/\mathbf{m}^2\} = \cap\{I \in \mathrm{Id}(R) : r \in I\} = (r)$ and obviously $sc(f) = s(r) = (sr) \neq (0)$, since r, s are nonzero and R is an integral domain.

This argument is the base for our definition for McCoy semialgebras:

Definition 2.4. Let B be an S-semialgebra. We define B to be a McCoy S-semialgebra, if B is an Ohm-Rush S-semialgebra and $g \cdot f = 0$ for $g, f \in B$ with $g \neq 0$ implies $s \cdot c(f) = 0$ for a nonzero $s \in S$.

Example 2.5. Let X be an indeterminate on a semiring S. It is clear that by Theorem 1.1, $S[X]$ is a McCoy S-semialgebra.

In Theorem 19 in [21], it has been proved that S is a weak Gaussian semiring if and only if each prime ideal of S is subtractive. Now we prove a generalization of this interesting theorem in the following:

Theorem 2.6. *Let S be a semiring and M a cancellative torsion-free commutative monoid. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(1) $c(fg) \subseteq c(f)c(g) \subseteq \sqrt{c(fg)}$, for all $f, g \in S[M]$,
(2) $\sqrt{I}$ is subtractive for each ideal I of the semiring S,
(3) Each prime ideal $\mathbf{p}$ of S is subtractive.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Suppose I is an ideal of S and $a, b \in S$ such that $a + b, a \in \sqrt{I}$. We need to show that $b \in \sqrt{I}$. Let $v \in M - \{0\}$ and put $f = a + bX^v$ and $g = b + (a + b)X^v$. Then just like the proof of [21, Theorem 19], we have $b \in \sqrt{I}$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3): Obvious.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1): Let each prime ideal $\mathbf{p}$ of S be subtractive. We need to show that $c(f)c(g) \subseteq \sqrt{c(fg)}$, for all $f, g \in S[M]$. Let $f, g \in S[M]$ and suppose that $\mathbf{p}$ is a prime ideal of S and $c(fg) \subseteq \mathbf{p}$. Obviously $fg \in \mathbf{p}[M]$. But by Theorem 1.2, the ideal $\mathbf{p}[M]$ is a prime ideal of $S[M]$ and so either $f \in \mathbf{p}[M]$ or $g \in \mathbf{p}[M]$ and this means that either $c(f) \subseteq \mathbf{p}$ or $c(g) \subseteq \mathbf{p}$ and in any case $c(f)c(g) \subseteq \mathbf{p}$. Consequently by [10, Proposition 7.28 (Krull's Theorem)] - that says that $\sqrt{I} = \bigcap_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathrm{Spec}_I(S)} \mathbf{p}$, where by $\mathrm{Spec}_I(S)$ we mean the set of all prime ideals of S containing I, we have $c(f)c(g) \subseteq \bigcap_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathrm{Spec}_{c(fg)}(S)} \mathbf{p} = \sqrt{c(fg)}$ and the proof is complete. □

It is clear that by the definition of weak content semialgebras, the following corollary holds:

Corollary 2.7. *If S is a weak Gaussian semiring and M a cancellative torsion-free commutative monoid, then $S[M]$ is a weak content S-semialgebra.*

Now we are going to give a generalization of the main theorem in the paper [25] by Douglas Geoffrey Northcott (1916–2005).

Theorem 2.8. *Let S be a semiring and M a cancellative torsion-free commutative monoid. Then $S[M]$ is a content S-semialgebra if and only if S is a subtractive semiring.*

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$): Let I be an ideal of S. Take $v \in M - \{0\}$ and $a, b \in S$ such that $a + b, a \in I$. Define $f = 1 + X^v$ and $g = a + bX^v + aX^{2v}$. It is easy to see that $fg = a+(a+b)X^v+(a+b)X^{2v}+aX^{3v}$, $c(f) = S$, $c(g) = (a, b)$ and $c(fg) = (a+b, a)$. But according to our assumption, Dedekind-Mertens content formula holds and therefore there exists an $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $c(f)^{m+1}c(g) = c(f)^m c(fg)$. This means that $(a, b) = (a + b, a)$, which implies $b \in (a + b, a) \subseteq I$ and I is subtractive.

($\Leftarrow$): Take $f, g \in S[M]$. The same discussion, in the proof of Theorem 1.2, shows that there exists a finitely generated torsion-free Abelian group M_0 such that $f, g \in S[M_0]$, which means that f, g can be considered to be elements of a Laurent polynomial semiring with finite number of indeterminates. So by Theorem 6 in [21], Dedekind-Mertens content formula holds for f, g and this finishes the proof. □

Remark 2.9. In Theorem 3 in [23], it has been shown that if R is a ring and M is a commutative monoid and $R[M]$ is a content R-algebra, then M is a cancellative torsion-free monoid. This is not necessarily the case when R is a proper semiring. Imagine $\mathbb{B} = \{0, 1\}$. Now let M be a monoid with at least two elements. Obviously the monoid semiring $\mathbb{B}[M]$ is an entire semiring. Also note that if $f \in \mathbb{B}[M]$ is nonzero, then $c(f) = \mathbb{B}$. Obviously any free $\mathbb{B}$-semialgebra is an Ohm-Rush $\mathbb{B}$-semialgebra and this means that if $f, g \in \mathbb{B}[M]$ are both nonzero, then $c(fg) = \mathbb{B} = c(f)c(g)$. On the other hand, if either $f = 0$ or $g = 0$, then $c(fg) = c(f)c(g) = (0)$, which means the $\mathbb{B}[M]$ is a content (in fact Gaussian) $\mathbb{B}$-semialgebra, while M is quite arbitrary.

Proposition 2.10. *Let B be a McCoy S-semialgebra. If S is an entire semiring, then so is B.*

Proof. Let $g \cdot f = 0$, where $f, g \in B$ and $g \neq 0$. By definition, there exists a nonzero $s \in S$ such that $s \cdot c(f) = 0$. Since S is entire, $c(f) = 0$ and finally $f = 0$. □

From all we said we get that if S is a semiring whose one of its prime ideals is not subtractive then $S[X]$ is a McCoy, but not a weak content S-semialgebra. For example consider the idempotent semiring $S = \{0, u, 1\}$, where $1 + u = u + 1 = u$ ([16]). It is clear that the ideal $\{0, u\}$ is a prime ideal but not subtractive. Now imagine $f = 1+uX$ and $g = u+X$. It is easy to see that $fg = (1+uX)(u+X) = u+uX+uX^2$, $c(fg) = \{0, u\}$ and $c(f)c(g) = S$ while $\sqrt{c(fg)} = \sqrt{\{0, u\}} = \{0, u\}$ and this means that $c(f)c(g) \nsubseteq \sqrt{c(fg)}$, i.e., $S[X]$ is not weak content S-semialgebra, while by Theorem 1.1, it is a McCoy S-semialgebra.

Let us recall that a semiring S is said to be nilpotent-free, if $s^n = 0$ implies $s = 0$ for all $s \in S$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now we give an interesting family of McCoy semialgebras in the following:

Proposition 2.11. *Let S be a nilpotent-free semiring and B a weak content S-semialgebra. Then B is a McCoy S-semialgebra.*

Proof. Let $gf = 0$, where $g, f \in B$ and $g \neq 0$. Consequently $c(g)c(f) \subseteq \sqrt{c(gf)} = \sqrt{0} = 0$. Now $c(g) \neq 0$, since $g \neq 0$. Take a nonzero element $s \in c(g)$. Obviously $s \cdot c(f) = (0)$. Q.E.D. □

Question 2.12. Is there any weak content semialgebra that is not a McCoy semialgebra?

3. Zero-Divisors of McCoy Semialgebras

Let S be a semiring. Then it is clear that any content S-semialgebra is a weak content and a McCoy S-semialgebra. But now we show that there are weak content and McCoy S-semialgebras that are not content S-semialgebras:

Example 3.1. Let S be a weak Gaussian and non-subtractive semiring, that is, all its prime ideals are subtractive, while S possesses an ideal that is not subtractive. Note that there are such semirings. For example, refer to Proposition 21 in [21]. Then the S-semialgebra $S[X]$ is a weak content semialgebra, which obviously satisfies McCoy property (See Theorem 1.1 of the current paper), but still it is not a content S-semialgebra. So we have already obtained a weak content and a McCoy S-semialgebra that is not a content S-semialgebra.

Lemma 3.2. *Let S be a semiring and $\boldsymbol{p}_i$ a subtractive prime ideal of S for any $1 \leq i \leq n$. If B is a McCoy S-semialgebra, then $Z(S) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \boldsymbol{p}_i$ implies that $Z(B) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} (\boldsymbol{p}_i B)$.*

Proof. Let $f \in Z(B)$. Since B is a McCoy S-semialgebra, there is some $s \in S - \{0\}$ such that $s \cdot c(f) = 0$. This means that $c(f) \subseteq Z(S)$. But $Z(S) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{p}_i$, so by Theorem 1.14, there is an $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that $c(f) \subseteq \mathbf{p}_i$ and finally $f \in \mathbf{p}_i B$. □

Let us recall that if R is a ring and B is an Ohm-Rush R-algebra, then B is flat if and only if $c(r \cdot f) = r \cdot c(f)$ for any $r \in R$ and $f \in B$ [26, Corollary 1.6]. Since we are interested in the corresponding property for the content function on semialgebras, we believe it is a good idea to give a name to that. The term "homogeneous" in the following definition stems from the definition of "homogeneous functions" in mathematical analysis (Cf. [29, Ch 1, 4.1]).

Definition 3.3. Let B be an Ohm-Rush S-semialgebra. We say the content function c is homogeneous (of degree 1), if $c(s \cdot f) = s \cdot c(f)$ for each $s \in S$ and $f \in B$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let B be an Ohm-Rush S-semialgebra with homogeneous c and the corresponding homomorphism λ of the S-semialgebra B be injective. Then the following statements hold:*

(1) $\mathrm{Ann}_S(s)B = \mathrm{Ann}_B(\lambda(s))$ *for any $s \in S$;*
(2) If $Z(B) = \cup \boldsymbol{q}_i$, then $Z(S) = \cup(\boldsymbol{q}_i \cap S)$.

Proof. (1): $f \in \mathrm{Ann}_B(\lambda(s)) \Leftrightarrow s \cdot f = 0 \Leftrightarrow s \cdot c(f) = 0 \Leftrightarrow c(f) \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}_S(s) \Leftrightarrow f \in \mathrm{Ann}_S(s)B$.

(2): Let $s \in Z(S)$ be nonzero. So there is a nonzero $s' \in Z(S)$ such that $s \cdot s' = 0$. This implies that $\lambda(s) \cdot \lambda(s') = 0$. But since λ is injective, $\lambda(s)$ and $\lambda(s')$ are both nonzero in B. So $\lambda(s) \in Z(B)$ and therefore by our assumption, there is an i such that $\lambda(s) \in \mathbf{q}_i$, i.e., $s \in \mathbf{q}_i \cap S$. Now let $s \in \mathbf{q}_i \cap S$. So $\lambda(s) \in \mathbf{q}_i$ and therefore $\lambda(s) \in Z(B)$. This means that there is a nonzero $g \in B$ such that $s \cdot g = 0$. Since c is homogeneous, $s \cdot c(g) = (0)$ and if we choose a nonzero element t of $c(g)$, we have $s \cdot t = 0$ and $s \in Z(S)$. □

Let us recall that a semiring S has very few zero-divisors if the set of zero-divisors $Z(S)$ of S is a finite union of primes in $\mathrm{Ass}(S)$. For instance, by Theorem 49 in [21], any Noetherian semiring has very few zero-divisors. Rings and modules having very few zero divisors were introduced and studied in [22], [24] and [23].

Theorem 3.5. *Let S be a weak Gaussian semiring and B a McCoy and weak content S-semialgebra with homogeneous c and the corresponding homomorphism λ of the S-semialgebra B be injective. Then S has very few zero-divisors if and only if so does B.*

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$): Let S have very few zero-divisors. So by definition, $Z(S)$ is a finite union of primes $\mathbf{p}_i$ in $\mathrm{Ass}(S)$. Our claim is that $Z(B)$ is union of the ideals $\mathbf{p}_iB$.

Since $\mathbf{p}_i = \mathrm{Ann}(s_i)$ is subtractive, by Lemma 3.2, $Z(B) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{n}(\mathbf{p}_iB)$. Now let $f \in \mathbf{p}_iB$. So $c(f) \subseteq \mathbf{p}_i$. But c is homogeneous, so $s_i \cdot f = 0$ and this means that $f \in Z(B)$. Also note that since B is a weak content S-semialgebra, by Lemma 3.4, $\mathbf{p}_iB \in \mathrm{Ass}(B)$, which means that B has very few zero-divisors.

($\Leftarrow$): Let $Z(B) = \cup_{i=1}^{n}\mathbf{q}_i$, where $\mathbf{q}_i \in \mathrm{Ass}(B)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Therefore by Lemma 3.4, $Z(S) = \cup_{i=1}^{n}(\mathbf{q}_i \cap S)$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\mathbf{q}_i \cap S \nsubseteq \mathbf{q}_j \cap S$ for all $i \neq j$. Now we prove that $\mathbf{q}_i \cap S \in \mathrm{Ass}(S)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Consider $f \in B$ such that $\mathbf{q}_i = \mathrm{Ann}(f)$ and $c(f) = (s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_m)$. It is easy to see that $\mathbf{q}_i \cap S = \mathrm{Ann}(c(f)) \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}(s_1) \subseteq Z(S)$ and since every prime ideal of S is subtractive, by Theorem 1.14, $\mathbf{q}_i \cap S = \mathrm{Ann}(s_1)$. □

Corollary 3.6. *Let S be a weak Gaussian semiring. Then S has very few zero-divisors if and only if $S[X]$ does so.*

A semiring S is said to have Property (A), if I is a finitely generated ideal of S such that $I \subseteq Z(S)$, then $s \cdot I = (0)$ for some nonzero $s \in S$. Similar to ring theory, an element $s \in S$ is defined to be regular if s is not a zero-divisor on S. An ideal I of S is defined to be regular if it contains a regular element.

Theorem 3.7. *Let B be a McCoy S-semialgebra, which the corresponding homomorphism λ is injective. Let the content function $c : B \longrightarrow \mathrm{Fid}(S)$ be homogeneous and onto, where by $\mathrm{Fid}(S)$, we mean the set of finitely generated ideals of S. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(1) S has Property (A),
(2) For all $f \in B$, f is a regular element of B if and only if $c(f)$ is a regular ideal of S.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Let S have Property (A). If $f \in B$ is regular, then for all nonzero $s \in S$, $s \cdot f \neq 0$ and so for all nonzero $s \in S$, $s \cdot c(f) \neq (0)$, i.e., $\mathrm{Ann}(c(f)) = (0)$ and according to the definition of Property (A), $c(f) \nsubseteq Z(S)$. This means that $c(f)$ is a regular ideal of S. Now let $c(f)$ be a regular ideal of S, so $c(f) \nsubseteq Z(S)$ and therefore $\mathrm{Ann}(c(f)) = (0)$. This means that for all nonzero $s \in S$, $s \cdot c(f) \neq (0)$, hence for all nonzero $s \in S$, $s \cdot f \neq 0$. Since B is a McCoy S-semialgebra, f is not a zero-divisor of B.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1): Let I be a finitely generated ideal of S such that $I \subseteq Z(S)$. Since the content function $c : B \to \mathrm{Fid}(S)$ is onto, there exists an $f \in B$ such that $c(f) = I$. But $c(f)$ is not a regular ideal of S, therefore according to our assumption, f is not a regular element of B. Since B is a McCoy S-semialgebra, there exists a nonzero $s \in S$ such that $sc(f) = 0$ and this means that $sI = (0)$, i.e., I has a nonzero annihilator. □

Remark 3.8. In the above theorem the surjectivity condition for the content function c is necessary, because obviously S is a content S-semialgebra and the condition (2) is satisfied, while one can choose the semiring S such that it does not have Property (A) (Cf. [15, Exercise 7, p. 63]).

Theorem 3.9. *Let S be a weak Gaussian semiring and B a McCoy and weak content S-semialgebra such that the corresponding homomorphism λ is injective and $c : B \to \mathrm{Fid}(S)$ is a homogeneous and an onto function. Then B has few zero-divisors if and only if S has few zero-divisors and property (A).*

Proof. ($\Leftarrow$): Let $Z(S) = \cup \mathbf{p}_i$. Take $f \in \mathbf{p}_i B$. So $c(f) \subseteq \mathbf{p}_i \subseteq Z(S)$. Since S has property (A), there is some nonzero $s \in S$ such that $s \cdot c(f) = (0)$. Since c is homogeneous and λ is injective, $f \in Z(B)$. Now by lemma 3.2, the proof of this part is complete.

($\Rightarrow$): By considering Lemma 3.4, we only need to prove that S has property (A). Let $I \subseteq Z(S)$ be a finitely generated ideal of S. Since $c : B \to \mathrm{Fid}(S)$ is onto, there is an $f \in B$ such that $c(f) = I$ and by Prime Avoidance Theorem for prime ideals, $c(f) \subseteq \mathbf{q}_i \cap S$, where $Z(B) = \cup \mathbf{q}_i$. Now we have $f \in (\mathbf{q}_i \cap S)B \subseteq \mathbf{q}_i \subseteq Z(B)$. But B is a McCoy S-semialgebra. So there is some nonzero $s \in S$ such that $s \cdot I = (0)$. Q.E.D. □

A prime ideal $\mathbf{p}$ of a commutative ring R is said to be a strong Krull prime of R, if for any finitely generated ideal I of R, there exists a $z \in R$ such that $I \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}(z) \subseteq \mathbf{p}$, whenever $I \subseteq \mathbf{p}$ ([18]). For a nice introduction to strong Krull primes and their properties, one may refer to a recent paper by Epstein and Shapiro ([6]).

Definition 3.10. We define a prime ideal $\mathbf{p}$ of a semiring S to be a strong Krull prime of S, if for any finitely generated ideal I of S, there exists a $z \in S$ such that $I \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}(z) \subseteq \mathbf{p}$, whenever $I \subseteq \mathbf{p}$.

Lemma 3.11. *Let B be a weak content S-semialgebra such that the corresponding homomorphism λ is injective and c is homogeneous. If $\mathbf{p}$ is a strong Krull prime of S, then either $\mathbf{p}B = B$ or $\mathbf{p}B$ is a strong Krull prime of B.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{p}B \neq B$ and J be a finitely generated ideal of B such that $J \subseteq \mathbf{p}B$, where $\mathbf{p}$ is a strong Krull prime of S. Assume that $J = (f_1, \ldots, f_k)$ for $f_1, \ldots, f_k \in B$. This means that $f_i \in \mathbf{p}B$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. This implies that $c(f_i) \subseteq \mathbf{p}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Since $\mathbf{p}$ is a strong Krull prime of S and $c(f_1)+\cdots+c(f_k) \subseteq \mathbf{p}$ is a finitely generated ideal of S, there exists an $s \in S$ such that $c(f_1)+\cdots+c(f_k) \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}(s) \subseteq \mathbf{p}$. Obviously s annihilates every f_i and so J is annihilated by s, i.e., $J \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}(\lambda(s))$. The final phase of the proof is to show that $\mathrm{Ann}(\lambda(s)) \subseteq \mathbf{p}$. Let $f \in \mathrm{Ann}(\lambda(s))$. So $s \cdot f = 0$ and therefore $s \cdot c(f) = 0$. This means that $c(f) \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}(s) \subseteq \mathbf{p}$ and finally $f \in \mathbf{p}B$. □

Theorem 3.12. *Let B be a McCoy and weak content S-semialgebra such that the corresponding homomorphism λ is injective and c is homogeneous. If $Z(S)$ is a finite union of strong Krull primes of S, then $Z(B)$ is a finite union of strong Krull primes of B.*

Proof. Let $f \in \mathbf{p}_i B$ for some i. So $c(f) \subseteq \mathbf{p}_i$. But $\mathbf{p}_i$ is a strong Krull prime of S and $c(f)$ is a finitely generated ideal of S, so there exists a $z \in S$ such that $c(f) \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}(z)$. This implies that $f \in Z(B)$. Finally by Lemma 3.2, $Z(B) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} (\mathbf{p}_i B)$ and at least one of those $\mathbf{p}_i B$s is a proper ideal of B. On the other hand by Lemma 3.11, if $\mathbf{p}_i B \neq B$, then $\mathbf{p}_i B$ must be a strong Krull prime of B and this completes the proof. □

References

[1] W. Bruns and J. Gubeladze, *Polytopes, Rings, and K-Theory*, Springer, Dordrecht, 2009.
[2] J. Dauns, *Primal modules*, Comm. Algebra **25** (1997), No. 8, 2409–2435.
[3] E. Davis, *Overrings of commutative rings II. Integrally closed overrings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc, **110** (1964), 196–212.
[4] P. Eakin and J. Silver, *Rings which are almost polynomial rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **174** (1974), 425–449.
[5] N. Epstein and J. Shapiro, *A Dedekind-Mertens theorem for power series rings*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **144** (2016), 917–924.
[6] N. Epstein and J. Shapiro, *Strong krull primes and flat modules*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **218** (2014), No. 9, 1712–1729.
[7] N. Epstein and J. Shapiro, *The Ohm-Rush content function*, J. Algebra Appl., **15**, No. 1 (2016), 1650009 (14 pages).
[8] D. E. Fields, *Zero divisors and nilpotent elements in power series rings*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **27** (1971), no. 3, 427–433.
[9] R. Gilmer, *Multiplicative Ideal Theory*, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1972.
[10] J. S. Golan, *Semirings and Their Applications*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1999.
[11] M. Gondran, M. Minoux, *Graphs, Dioids and Semirings*, Springer, New York, 2008.
[12] M. Hochster, *Topics in the homological theory of modules over commutative rings*, CBMS Regional Conf. Ser. in Math., **24**, Amer. Math. Soc, Providence, RI, 1975.
[13] J. A. Huckaba and J. M. Keller, *Annihilation of ideals in commutative rings*, Pac. J. Math. **83** (1979), 375–379.
[14] U. Hebisch and H. J. Weinert, *Semirings - Algebraic Theory and Applications in Computer Science*, World Scientific, Singapore, (1998).
[15] I. Kaplansky, *Commutative Rings*, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, 1970.
[16] S. LaGrassa, *Semirings: Ideals and Polynomials*, PhD. Thesis, University of Iowa, 1995.
[17] N. H. McCoy, *Remarks on divisors of zero*, Amer. Math. Monthly, **49** (1942), 286–295.
[18] K. McDowell, *Associated prime divisors and finitely presented modules*, unpublished manuscript, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, 1975.
[19] P. Nasehpour, *Content Algebras Over Commutative Rings With Zero-Divisors*, arXiv preprint arXiv:0807.1835 (2008).
[20] P. Nasehpour, *Content Algebras and Zero-Divisors*, dissertation, University of Osnabrück, Osnabrück, 2011.
[21] P. Nasehpour, *On the content of polynomials over semirings and its applications*, J. Algebra Appl., **15**, No. 5 (2016), 1650088 (32 pages).
[22] P. Nasehpour, *Zero-divisors of content algebras*, Arch. Math. (Brno), **46** (4) (2010), 237–249.
[23] P. Nasehpour, *Zero-divisors of semigroup modules*, Kyungpook Math. J., **51** (1) (2011), 37–42.
[24] P. Nasehpour and Sh. Payrovi, *Modules having few zero-divisors*, Comm. Algebra **38** (2010), 3154–3162.
[25] D. G. Northcott, *A generalization of a theorem on the content of polynomials*, Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **55** (1959), 282–288.
[26] J. Ohm and D. E. Rush, *Content modules and algebras*, Math. Scand. **31** (1972), 49–68.
[27] D. E. Rush, *Content algebras*, Canad. Math. Bull. Vol. **21** (3) (1978), 329–334.
[28] K. Spindler, *Abtract Algebra with Applications*, Vol. 1, Dekker, New York, 1994.
[29] D. V. Widder, *Advanced Calculus*, 2nd ed, Dover Publications, New York, 1989.

Peyman Nasehpour, Department of Engineering Science, Faculty of Engineering, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

E-mail address: nasehpour@gmail.com